

REMARKS

Claims 9-13 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shima '894 in view of Fan et al. '706. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection

According to the claimed invention, the access restriction information indicating whether access from the printing apparatus to each of the servers is permitted or restricted is registered, whether the access from the printing apparatus to the specified server is permitted or restricted is determined based on the access restriction information, and the specified server is accessed in a case where it is determined that the access from the printing apparatus to the specified server is permitted. In other words, the printing apparatus registers in itself the access restriction information indicating whether the access from itself to each of the servers is permitted or restricted, and the printing apparatus determines by itself whether the access from itself to the specified server is permitted or restricted.

In contrast, Shima discloses a network printer 11 provided with a receive control section 16, wherein the receive control section 16 accesses a Web page as information resources specified by a host computer 1 and downloads only predetermined information from the Web page (See col. 5, lines 37 to 66). The network printer 11, however, does not include information for controlling access from the network printer 11 to the Web page, and hence cannot control the access from itself to the Web page.

Fan et al. discloses a router/firewall 10 positioned between a host 6 and a host 12 which controls traffic therebetween (Figure 1). Specifically, if security access policy prevents SMTP sessions initiated from IP host 1.1.1.1. with a destination address 2.2.2.2., a packet filter would discard packets that have IP destination address=2.2.2.2. and IP source address=1.1.1.1. (See col. 8, lines 53 to 58). The router/firewall 10, however, merely registers information indicating prevention of SMTP sessions from the IP host 1.1.1.1. to a host with the address 2.2.2.2., but does not register information indicating whether access from the router/firewall 10 to the host with the address 2.2.2.2. is permitted or restricted. Therefore, the router/firewall 10 merely determines whether the sessions from the IP host 1.1.1.1. to the host with the address 2.2.2.2. is permitted or not, but cannot determine whether the access from the router/firewall 10 to the host with the address 2.2.2.2. is permitted or restricted.

Accordingly, applicant submits that neither Shima nor Fan et al. discloses or in any way suggests execution of registration of access restriction information indicating whether access from the network printer 11 or the router/firewall 10 to the host with the address 2.2.2.2. or the Web page is permitted or restricted, and determination of whether the access from the network

printer 11 or the router/firewall 10 to the host with the address 2.2.2.2. or the Web page is permitted or restricted, by the network printer 11 or the router/firewall 10. As a result, even if Shima and Fan et al. could be somehow combined, a person skilled in the art would not be lead to the implementation of a registration device and a determination device as claimed. The rejection of the claims is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance, notice of which is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

20 FEBRUARY 2009

/MARC A. ROSSI/

DATE

MARC A. ROSSI
REG. No. 31,923

20609 GORDON PARK SQUARE
SUITE 150
ASHBURN, VA 20147
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)